UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,607	10/23/2001	Lino Tavares	208.1004US	1029

7590 02/11/2005

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
14th Floor
485 Seventh Avenue
New York, NY 10018

EXAMINER	
GHALI, ISIS A D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1615	

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/045,607	TAVARES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Isis Ghali	1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 December 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *8-11,13,14,16,20,22-24,29,30,32-38 and 40-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *8-11,13,14,16,20, 22-24,29,30,32-38 and 40-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The receipt is acknowledged of applicants' amendment, request for extension of time and request under 37 C.F.R.1.114, all filed 12/06/2004.

Claims 1-7, 12, 15, 17-19, 21, 25-28, 31 and 39 have been canceled.

Claims 8-11, 13, 14, 16, 20, 22-24, 29, 20, 32-28, and 40-45 are included in the prosecution.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/06/2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 8-11, 13, 14, 16, 20-24, 29, 30, 32-38, 40-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,910,205 ('205).

US '205 teaches a transdermal delivery system of loratadine for the treatment of allergic conditions (abstract). The system is formed of patch applied to skin for a specific period of time to permit the penetration of a desired amount of loratadine through the skin. The patch will be worn for one to four days and provides a total daily dose of 0.5 to 5 mg (col.2, lines 28-34). The patch comprises a reservoir having 10-20% loratadine; 50-60% solvent; and 20-35% fatty acid esters, i.e. softening agents (col.2, lines 19-29). The patch further comprises a backing layer and a release liner (col.2, line 64; col.3, line 6). The patch delivers 2.26 mg/15cm^2/day of loratadine (Table I). The reference

disclosed that the dose may be varied depending on the size and age of the patient, and may also depends upon the severity of the condition being treated (col.3, lines 56-60). The frequency of dosage application can be once every 3 days to once every 7 days (col.4, lines 5-10).

The reference does not teach the specific delivery profile of loratadine, the specific amounts of different ingredients, or specific solvents and softening agents in the transdermal delivery system.

It is expected to have the same delivery profile from a transdermal delivery device disclosed by the prior art that has the same composition and the same amount of loratadine.

The claimed amounts of different ingredients in the reservoir layer do not impart patentability to the claims because it is within the skill in the art to select optimal parameters in order to achieve a beneficial effect. Thus, the claimed amounts of the drug, solvent and the softening agent are not considered critical, absent evidence to the contrary.

The selection of particular solvent and softening agent for a specific drug is within the skill of the art depending on the properties of the each drug and its intended use. Thus the solvents and softening agents claimed in claims 37, 38, 44, and 45, do not impart patentability to the presented claims, absent evident to the contrary.

The determination of the relative release rate via an in-vitro permeation test utilizing a Valia-Chien cell is known in the art and it is not part of the claimed method of treating allergic rhinitis; or even a part of the transdermal device that provide particular

plasma levels of loratadine. It is only an in-vitro diagnostic test that is expected to provide the same results obtained from two similar delivery devices tested under the same circumstances, and the recitation of this in-vitro test does not impart patentability to claims directed to method of treating allergic rhinitis or claims directed to transdermal device applied to patients to provide specific plasma levels of loratadine, i.e. in vivo use.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a transdermal device to deliver loratadine to treat allergic conditions as disclosed by US '205, and adjust the dose to deliver a specific desired plasma profile according to the patient's need, motivated by the teachings of US '205 that the dose may be varied depending on the size and age of the patient, and may also depends upon the severity of the condition being treated, with reasonable expectation of having a transdermal drug delivery device that delivers loratadine at the desired levels and treats allergic conditions effectively.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/06/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traverse the above obviousness rejection by arguing that the reference does not disclose method of maintaining transdermal delivery of loratadine to the patient's skin for 5 days at steady state plasma level of loratadine from 1-3 ng/ml to provide the claimed release rates.

In response to the above arguments, the examiner is pointing to col.4, lines 6-9 of US '205 where the reference teaches delivery from 5-7 days. The reference disclosed

providing constant blood level of loratadine to the patient in need, as desired by applicants, col.2, lines 36-37. The patch delivers 2.26 mg/15 cm^2/day of loratadine, which is the same amount delivered by the instant patch. It is expected to obtain the same plasma level from the transdermal patch that deliver loratadine to the skin at the same rate. Determination of the drug dose is within the skill of the art and it is controlled by many variables such as age, weight, severity of the allergic reaction, etc. In any event, the reference disclosed the same amount of loratadine in the transdermal patch as claimed by applicants, i.e. 10-20%.

5. Claims 37, 38, 44, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US '205 in view of US 5,240,711 ('711).

The teachings of US '205 are discussed above.

The reference does not teach the specific solvents and softening agents and their amount.

US '711 teaches a transdermal drug delivery device for controlled delivery of drug comprising backing layer, polymeric reservoir and protective liner. The reservoir comprising: 20-90% of polymeric material, 0.1-20% of the drug, 0.1-30% softener, and 0.1-30% of solvent (abstract; col.1, line 64-67; col.4, line 23). The reservoir is pressure sensitive adhesive and contains rubber-like co-, homo-, or block-copolymers (col.3, lines 25-26). The solvents used include those contain at least one acidic group, monoesters of dicarboxylic acids, such as monoethyl glutarate (col.4, lines 13-16). The softeners include medium chain triglycerides of the caprylic/capric acids or coconut oil;

and dodecanol (col.3, lines 63-68; col.4, lines 1-2; col.7, lines 25-29). The backing is flexible, inflexible or aluminum foil (col.7, lines 5-12).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to treat allergic conditions using a transdermal device comprising loratadine that provides a specific delivery profile and having particular structure as disclosed by US '205, and select the specific solvents and softening agents disclosed by US '711, motivated by the teaching of US '711 that the transdermal device having these particular ingredients in its reservoir layer provides a controlled delivery of the drug, with reasonable expectation of having a transdermal drug delivery device to deliver loratadine to treat allergic conditions effectively.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/06/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traverse the above rejection by arguing that US '711 only teaches buprenophine transdermally, thus, one skilled in the art would not modify US '205 with US '711 in order to formulate loratadine transdermal delivery system.

In response to the above argument, the examiner position is US '711 is relied upon for the solely teaching of the solvents and softening agents that are known in the art and widely used in conventional transdermal devises for controlled release of the drugs. In considering the disclosure of the reference, it is proper to take into account not only the specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom. *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825,

826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968). The rational to modify or to combine the prior art does not have to be expressly stated in the prior art; the rational may be expressly or impliedly contained in the prior art or it may be reasoned from knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 5,045,319 disclosed transdermal delivery system to deliver pharmaceuticals wherein the in-vitro release studies can be conducted using Valia-Chien diffusion cell.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isis Ghali whose telephone number is (571) 272-0595. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page can be reached on (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Isis Ghali
Examiner
Art Unit 1615

Isis Ghali

ISIS GHALI
PATENT EXAMINER